

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please add the new sheet of drawings with Figs. 1 and 2 which is submitted with this paper. The new drawings add no new matter.

REMARKS

As a preliminary, Applicant and Applicant's representative thank the Examiner and his Supervisor for the personal interview which was held on June 18, 2008.

By the present amendment, a new sheet of drawings with illustrative Figs. 1 and 2 is submitted. The new drawings add no new matter. Support for the illustrated features is found in the original application, for example from page 4, line 30 to page 5, line 13 and page 8, line 10.

The specification has been amended to add section subtitles and to introduce a short description of Figs. 1 and 2 as well as an explanation of the illustrated features.

Claim 1 has been amended to specify that each of the first and second plies is a material layer, to number the first authentication element provided within a region of non-zero thickness of the first ply, and the second authentication element provided within an area of non-zero thickness of the second ply, and to replace "and/or" by "at least one of... and...." Support for the added recitation is immediately derived from the description and its embodiments, for example, page 4, line 15, and page 5, line 21 and 35.

Dependent claims 4, 6, 8, and 10 have been amended accordingly.

Also, claims 2, 9 and 11 have been amended to clarify that the second ply comprises a reinforcing element, and claim 4 has been amended to clarify that the second ply comprises a second authentication element.

Claim 11 has also been amended to replace "in that said paper" by "said security paper."

New claims 19-22 have been added.

Claim 19 depends on claim 1 and recites the reinforcing element of claim 1. Claim 20 depends on claim 1 and recites the second authentication element of claim 1. Claim 21 depends

on claim 1 and recites a watermark as first authentication element in the first ply and a reinforcing element in the second ply. Support for the added recitations is found in the original application, for example, in claims 1 and 8.

Claim 22 corresponds to claim 13 rewritten in independent form by incorporating therein the subject matter of original claim 1.

Claims 1-22 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 is the only independent claim.

In the Office Action, claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by US 5,961,432 to Murakami et al. ("Murakami'432").

Further, in the Office Action, claims 1-10, 12, and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Murakami'432 in view of US 5,565,276 to Murakami et al. ("Murakami'276"). [It is noted that claims 15-17 are not listed in the header paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action, but that they are explicitly included in this rejection on pages 5-6 of the Office Action.]

Also, claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Murakami'432 in view of Murakami'276 and further in view of "Nordic Pulp and Paper Research".

As a preliminary, it is noted that claim 13 is not included in either in the header or body of the rejections. Accordingly, it is submitted that new claim 22, which corresponds to the subject matter of claim 13 rewritten in independent form by incorporating therein the subject matter of claim 1 before the present amendment, is not subject to the present rejections.

Further, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

First, with respect to present claim 1, as shown in Fig. 2 of Murakami'432, both the watermark and the indicia of Murakami'432 are provided on material ply 4, whereas material ply 3 is simply provided with a window, i.e., an opening that make the watermark and indicia of the ply 4 visible from the viewing side of ply 3. Further, Murakami'432 is silent regarding a reinforcing element in one of the ply that is substantially absent in the other ply. Thus, Murakami'432 does not disclose a first ply that is an external ply including at least one first authentication element provided within a region of non-zero thickness of the first ply, and the other ply, the second ply, comprising at least one of (i) a reinforcing element substantially absent from the first ply, said reinforcing element being chosen from materials that improve the mechanical strength; and (ii) a second authentication element provided within an area of non-zero thickness of the second ply, wherein the first authentication element of the first ply is absent from the second ply, as recited in present claim 1. Therefore, present claim 1 is not anticipated by Murakami'432.

Further, it is submitted that the description of Murakami'432 illustrates what is presented as an improvement of the paper of Murakami'256, in that it proposes (i) to provide several security features in the first layer 4 (watermarks 2 and thread 5) and (ii) to cut windows in the second layer 3 so that the security features of the first layer 4 be more easily detected. As a result, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been led to refer to Murakami'256 in order to modify Murakami'432.

Even if, arguendo, a person of ordinary skill in the art had attempted to modify Murakami'432 by referring to Murakami'256, that person would have taken into account the fact that Murakami'256 discloses a reinforced security paper with anti-falsification elements where

the anti-falsification elements are provided in the same layer that already includes the reinforcement. As a consequence, the person of ordinary skill in the art would have been led to add even more security features or reinforcements in the layer 4 and/or to adjust the layer 3 to make the security features of the first layer more accessible, but neither Murakami'256 nor Murakami'432 suggests providing security features in both layers, let alone different security features, neither do they suggest providing layers that are differentiated in terms of reinforcing materials.

Specifically, Murakami'432 clearly provides both the watermark and the indicia on its lower ply 4, whereas the ply 3 is only provided with a viewing opening, so that the person of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify Murakami'432 contrary to the teaching of Murakami'256 by separating the reinforcement and the anti-falsification elements of Murakami'256 from the ply 3 of Murakami'432. As a result, any combination of Murakami'432 and '256 would not have resulted in the presently claimed invention. Therefore, the present claims are not obvious over Murakami'432 taken alone or in any combination with Murakami'256.

In addition, with respect to the dependent claims, it is submitted that the combined features recited in these respective claims are not taught or suggested in the cited references. Therefore, each of these respective claims is not anticipated by, and not obvious over, the cited references taken alone or in any combination.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

If there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

NES/rep